## NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

## IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

## **DIVISION TWO**

In re RODERICK M., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

V.

RODERICK M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

E034497

(Super.Ct.No. J188520)

**OPINION** 

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Douglas N. Gericke, Judge. Affirmed.

R. Charles Johnson, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

On May 19, 2003, the San Bernardino County District Attorney filed an original juvenile wardship petition pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, which

alleged violations of Penal Code sections 286, subdivision (b)(1) (sodomy of a person under 18), 286, subdivision (c)(2) (sodomy by use of force), and 261, subdivision (a)(2) (forcible rape), as charged in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the original petition.

Thereafter, on July 11, 2003, the original petition was amended to add paragraph 4, a violation of Penal Code section 261.5, subdivision (c), unlawful sexual intercourse. As a consequence of the amendment, Minor, represented by counsel, admitted the allegations charged in paragraph 1 (Pen. Code, § 286, subd. (b)(1)), sodomy of a person under 18, and paragraph 4 (Pen. Code, § 261.5, subd. (c)), unlawful sexual intercourse.

On September 12, 2003, a disposition hearing was concluded and Minor was committed to the California Youth Authority after the appropriate findings were made. The court also granted the People's motion to dismiss the remaining counts in the interests of justice pursuant to Penal Code section 1385.

Minor appealed and upon his request, this court appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 [87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493], setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of the facts, and requesting this court to undertake a review of the entire record.

We offered minor an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief which he has not done.

We have now concluded our independent review of the record and find no arguable issues.

The judgment is affirmed.

## NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

		RAMIREZ	RAMIREZ	
			P. J.	
We concur:				
GAUT				
KING				
	Ĭ			